



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/682,586

10/09/2003

Edward R. diGirolamo

4782-030

9767

24112 7590 11/24/2008
COATS & BENNETT, PLLC
1400 Crescent Green, Suite 300
Cary, NC 27518

EXAMINER

A, PHI DIEU TRAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3633

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/24/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/682,586	Applicant(s) DIGIROLAMO ET AL.	
	Examiner PHI D. A	Art Unit 3633	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,6-11,21-24 and 34-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9 and 10 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,6-8,11,21-24 and 34-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 3633

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 2-3 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

The limitations of “ at least one flange”, and “ spaced apart flanges” are in the amended independent claim 1. The limitations are thus redundant and need to be canceled.

Claims 9 and 10 also need to be labeled as "withdrawn". The claims are treated as withdrawn claims per the election on 3/6/2006.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 21-24, 34-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Vukmanic (4677802).

Art Unit: 3633

Vukmanic shows a stud spacer (12) for extending between two studs with each stud having an opening therein, the spacer comprising a main member (17), the main member including first and second end portions(40), a projection (41) extending from one of the end portions, an opening (50) formed in the other end portion, at least one flange (71) for connecting to one of the two studs, spaced apart flanges (71, and at 40) for connecting to one of the two studs, the opening formed in the second end portion of the main member including a slot, a projection receiver (50) formed in the other end portion, either the projection or projection receiver including one or more locking members such that when a projection of one of the spacer is projected into the receiver of another spacer, a locked condition is realized, either the projection or projection receiver includes one or more stops for engaging the one or more locking members (figure 4), the locking members are disposed on the projection and the stops form a part of the receiver, at least a portion of the projection is deflectable in response to the projection engaging the receiver, the projection and receiver are disposed such that when consecutive stud spacers are connected together, the projections and receivers will overlies each other (figure 4), the projection and receiver include a flap that is at least partially flexible, in a locked position, the flaps of the projection and receiver engage each other (figure 4), both the projection and receiver include a flexible flap, a hold down element, an opening disposed between the flap and the hold down element, a deflector, an opening disposed between the deflector and the hold down element.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3633

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 6, 8, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Soucy (3778952) in view of Pellock (5884448).

Soucy (figures 2-4) shows a stud spacer for extending between two studs with each stud (12) having an opening therein, the stud spacer comprising a main member (32) adapted to extend between the two studs; the main member including first and second end portions; a projection (42) extending from one of the end portions; an opening (the slots between part 38 and 32) formed in the other end portion; and wherein one stud spacer is adapted to be connected to another stud spacer by extending the projection of the one stud spacer through the opening within one stud and into the opening of another stud spacer, the opening formed in the second end portion of the main member including a slot.

Soucy does not show the main member including a pair of side flanges and a pair of end flanges, the end flanges are adapted to be connected to the two studs that the stud spacer extends between.

Pellock shows the main member(22) including a pair of side flanges(30, 32) and a pair of end flanges(38, 40), the end flanges are adapted to be connected to the two studs that the stud spacer extends between.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Soucy's structure to show the main member including a pair of side flanges and a pair of end flanges, the end flanges are adapted to be connected to the two studs that the

Art Unit: 3633

stud spacer extends between since the flanges enhance the securement of the spacer to its supporting structures and reinforce the main member against bending as taught by Pellock.

Per claims 6, 8, Soucy as modified further shows the main member including a central section and the side flanges are turned out of the plane of the central section, at least one end flange is divided into at least two portions and the projections extends between the two portions.

3. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Soucy (3778952) in view of Pellock (5884448) as applied to claim 6 above and further in view of Tollenaar (6705056).

Soucy as modified shows all the claimed limitations including except for the end flanges and the side flanges are turned in opposite directions with respect to the central section.

Tollenaar discloses the end flanges(31a) and the side flanges (the part connecting to part 31b) are turned in opposite directions with respect to the central section.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Soucy's modified structure to show the end flanges and the side flanges are turned in opposite directions with respect to the central section as taught by Tollenaar since it enables the easy secured attachment of the stud spacer to the studs with the end flanges as access to the end flanges are not blocked by the side flanges.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8, 11, 21-24, 34-38 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 3633

With respect to claims 21-24, 34-38, the rejection is maintained as the reference reads on the claimed limitations as set forth above. The response to applicant's argument in the previous office action of 1/10/2007 still applies.

With respect to claims 1-3, 6-8, 11, examiner would like to state the following. First of all, modifying Soucy with Pellock would enhance the securement of the spacer to its supporting structures and reinforce the main member against bending. Secondly, modifying Soucy with Pellock would not prevent the reference Soucy from functioning as intended; rather the modification improves upon Soucy's teaching per the enhanced configuration of the structure. As is well known in the art, a structure is better protected against bending with flanges extending perpendicular to its sides, flanges at its ends allows for easy attachment to its supporting structures. The arguments are thus moot.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 3633

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phi D A whose telephone number is 571-272-6864. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Glessner can be reached on 571-272-6843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Phi D A/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3633

Phi Dieu Tran A

24/11/0810/27/08